

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 21, 1912

No. 10

Of high value is every plea for the Classics made by those who are not primarily concerned with the teaching of the Classics. Such a plea was that by Mr. Paul Elmer More, at the recent meeting of The New York Latin Club, briefly summarized in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 671; another was Professor Sherman's paper, English and the Latin Question, reprinted in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.201-203, 209-213. Still another is the address delivered on April 1, 1912, after the initiation of new members into the New York Theta Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, at Cornell University, by Professor Lane Cooper, President of the Chapter, and a member of the Department of English at Cornell University. The theme of the address was Ancient and Modern Letters. Mr. Cooper held that many signs point to the coming rehabilitation of Greek, and that in this rehabilitation the teachers of modern literatures—especially English—will play a large part. Having insisted on the value of the English language and literature in any scheme of education, Mr. Cooper proceeds as follows:

Having said so much, I shall not be misunderstood when I add that it is the most pernicious of errors to assume that one subject, considered in itself, is as important as another in a general scheme of studies. Properly considered, English, the most important of modern literatures except Italian, is a very feeble instrument of education indeed in comparison with the classics, if it be dissociated from them; and if a severance were necessary between the ancient and modern, the modern had better be dropped from the curriculum, and the ancient, above all the Greek, retained.

There is at present no likelihood that such a mischance will occur. What seems probable is that the teachers of modern languages will more and more clearly recognize the impossibility of pursuing their respective subjects, French, German, Italian, English, with students who are innocent of Greek and Latin. They will more and more insistently demand that what is fundamental, what precedes in point of logic as well as time, shall be acquired by students before they approach the special investigation of a modern literature. In fact, during the past few decades, while Greek may have seemed to be losing ground, and Latin perhaps not to be gaining, eminent scholars in English have been sending out of our American universities a succession of young doctors of philosophy convinced that the hope of the classics is the hope of any thorough general culture, and that the cause of English will stand or fall

with that of Greek. What these eminent teachers of English have been doing, the eminent teachers of other modern literatures have likewise been doing, with the result that we possess in the best-trained younger men and women in some of the more popular subjects of instruction a growing influence in favor of the classics, to be added to the persistent influence of classical scholars themselves.

It would be impossible to explain in brief the cogent reasons that move these teachers of modern literature in their effort to direct the younger generation betimes into the study of Greek and Latin; yet a few remarks upon the relation of our own literature to the classics may not at this point be lacking in suggestiveness.

It will be granted, I suppose, that the first requisite in understanding a poem in any language is a measure of sympathy with its author. The reader must have had certain experiences in common with the poet. Now, with exceptions so rare as to be negligible, the English poets, beginning with Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, and coming down to Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, have had the common experience of reading Latin; and from Spenser and Milton to Tennyson and Browning, most of them read Greek before they wrote English poetry of any consequence. The inference is obvious; let us put it in the form of the advice which one of these very poets, Wordsworth, gave to his nephew: "Remember, first read the ancient classical authors; then come to us, and you will be able to judge for yourself which of us is worth reading". Precisely so. Let our Freshmen and Sophomores first study Greek and Latin (and may we add history and mathematics?); then, in the Junior or, better, the Senior year, let them specialize if they will in English, and they will be able to judge for themselves what is worth while in that subject. As for prospective teachers of English, we may say to them: Remember, first acquaint yourselves with the method of interpretation and criticism which has been developed by twenty-three centuries of classical scholarship in Europe, and you will be able to judge for yourselves how much or how little variation there need be in applying this method to the study of the vernacular.

Next Professor Cooper points out how far wrong a student goes who, because he is ignorant of the Classics, fancies that a given thought is original with an English author, though in fact the thought has come to the English writer through a series of translations, let us say, from the Greek of Plutarch. As an example he compares the wonderful description in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* of the Egyptian queen as she first appeared to

Antony with the passage in Plutarch which Shakespeare was adapting, and then asks:

Upon this showing, which seems to be the more original, Shakespeare, or the biographer of Chæonea? And if Shakespeare and his age could draw such inspiration from Plutarch at two or three removes, why has Plutarch disappeared from the circle of humane studies to-day—that Plutarch who later fructified the genius of a modern educator, Rousseau? Moreover, Plutarch is himself but a late and relatively unoriginal Greek. The ultimate sources of vital ideas, of 'philosophia', lie far behind him.

Professor Cooper then reminds us that repeatedly some portion of a modern author is almost unintelligible unless we are familiar with the Greek or the Latin image he has in mind. So, he argues, Shelley's picture of himself in *Adonais*, 289-295, and the voluptuous nature of the hero in Wordsworth's poem *Ruth* mean little to the reader who knows nothing of the suffering wanderer Dionysus, or has not learned that the panther and the dolphin are the classic companions of Dionysus in his joy.

One might go on to multiply examples endlessly. The truth is, English literature from the time of Chaucer, far from being original in the ordinary acceptance of the word, is derivative to an extent undreamed of by the layman; and though the immediate sources of inspiration are often French and Spanish, more often, perhaps, Italian, the chief immediate source of most of the ideas of our poets has been Latin—and the ultimate source is Greek. All roads lead to Rome, is as true of English as of the modern Continental literatures; and a thousand roads lead back from Rome to Greece. Accordingly, the one great model of English prose is Cicero, whose model was Demosthenes; and the great writers of English prose from Milton to Burke, and from Burke to Newman, have been familiar with either or both. And the two chief wells whence English poets have drawn their notions of poetic style, as well as their mythological allusions, have been Virgil and Ovid—Virgil, who takes his inspiration from Homer, and Ovid who collected and arranged pretty much all that is known of Graeco-Roman mythology. To an age that is eager for any short cut whatsoever to the intelligent reading of our English poets, I would say that a hundred hours devoted to Ovid and Virgil, even read in translations, would be worth thousands of hours spent upon most of the books in the list adopted for 'Entrance English'. Of the mythological allusions in Shakespeare "for which a definite source can be assigned, it will be found that an overwhelming majority are directly due to Ovid, while the remainder, with few exceptions, are from Virgil". So says a competent investigator; and he adds: "A man familiar with these two authors, and with no others, would be able to make all the mythological allusions contained in the undisputed works of Shakespeare, barring some few exceptions"—which we may here neglect.

But we are not at present advocating a short cut to the interpretation of modern authors; if we were, it would be time to say something about the necessity of studying the English Bible before attempting to read authors who knew it by heart, and who use its thought and language as a common possession of the reading public. What we are advocating is a short cut to that inner substance of the

Greek classics, that 'sophia', which the Greeks especially loved, that leaven which has diffused itself, by way of Rome, throughout all modern literatures. There is but one short cut to the substance of Greek, and that way lies through the letters which enfold it. They are not dead, and they do not kill. The eternal spirit which inhabits those letters imparts its life to them, and makes them beautiful. There really is no arguing about the matter; only those who know that spirit, incarnate in those letters, are in a position to speak of the value of either in a system of education. Emphatically must we add that those who have dabbled in Greek, and have not loved it, or do not now love it, are not in a position to speak on the subject; nor are those who never had an opportunity of studying it. But the latter class at least may attend to the words of a teacher of English when he says: In nine cases out of ten, the undergraduates who think the best thoughts and express them in the best way, and who utter righteous judgment when they examine the standard modern authors, are those who have studied, or are studying, Greek and Latin. "A great London editor told me", observes Goldwin Smith in his *Reminiscences*, "that the only members of his staff who wrote in good form from the beginning had practised Latin verse". C. K.

THE GENESIS OF ROME'S MILITARY EQUIPMENT¹

Sometimes when our cohort of Caesar students becomes drowsy with the endless task of mutilating datives and ablatives and subjunctives, and it seems as if the sable goddess of sleep were destined to descend upon the helpless victims, a digression by the *dux tironum* is often found to be the best restorative. This paper on Roman arms is the outgrowth of one of several *digressiones*, prepared to serve the same purpose as side-trips, in which one finds much pleasure, when on an extended tour.

Were a text needed for my remarks, it would be chosen from Ovid *Met.* 4. 428: *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*, 'it is meet and proper to be taught even by an enemy'.

The Roman has been regarded as conservative. So he was, in general. But, when it came to cutlery, whatever conservatism he had in his system quickly trickled out of the incision made by a superior spear or sword. For instance, the deadly thrust of the short Spanish *gladius* was to the Roman an all-convincing *argumentum ad hominem* that his national weapons were antiquated.

The equipment of the legionary soldier of Caesar's day was indeed a composite of the best weapons of many tribes and nations, tested by several centuries of experience.

A typical legionary soldier, in full panoply of war, was equipped with *cassis*, *lorica*, *ocreae*, *pilum*, *scutum*, and *gladius*. In these caparisons there are several stratifications, each stratum having its own story to tell.

The lowest stratum of which we hear contained

¹This paper was read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Philadelphia, May 3, 1912.

square shields. Diodorus calls attention to this interesting piece of antiquarian lore in at least two places. As it is very doubtful whether the sword was known at all to the early inhabitants of Italy, the shield was probably used against missile weapons, such as the arrow and the spear. Indeed, there was found in Alba Longa a spear-head of great antiquity, lending peculiar apposition to this rather than the sword as Jove's favorite weapon. The Roman loved the clashing of broad-sword and of shield, and one might have expected to find the *gladius* in the hands of their Jove, supremely great.

To this period, too, it seems safe to assign the *galea*, but it was then only a hunter's cap, *galea venatoria*, of fur or hide, impressed into military service.

In the first hand-to-hand conflicts, however, it is hardly probable that the Romans could have used anything but a knife, since, as we may infer from Diodorus, it was a novel experience for the Romans to see troops fighting in regular ranks.

The next stratum is the Etruscan; perhaps it would not be amiss to call it the Graeco-Etruscan. The Etruscans in the infancy of their civilization were already settled in Etruria; there they developed and attained prosperity and commercial importance. Holding Northern Italy from sea to sea, they naturally came into contact with the Greeks far earlier than did the pastoral settlement on the Palatine, located, as it was, on the western side of the peninsula.

Etruscan monuments of a very early date represent warriors fully accoutered, with crested helmet, breastplate, greaves, shield, spear, and sword. Nothing would be more natural than for the Roman to adopt this equipment. Being of a practical turn of mind, he would certainly learn much from the first adversaries he met of a civilization higher than his own. As a matter of fact, we have literary evidence substantiating this view.

Cassis, as Isidore informs us (Origines 18.14), is an Etruscan word. The helmet probably made its advent with the word itself. *Balteus*, 'belt', is likewise an Etruscan term.

We are told, furthermore, that the Romans exchanged those square shields of which mention has been made for arms of Etruscan type. It must have taken but a glance for the practical Roman to see that the graceful round shield of bronze, easily handled and readily balanced, was far more effective in checking the over-familiarity of his foe's missiles than was his own clumsy angular device. The Greek writers of Roman affairs, recognizing that it was the Greek type of shield which was transmitted to Rome through Etruria, naturally apply to it the term 'Argolic'.

In this connection a passage in Dennis, *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria* 1.268, is interesting. In recounting discoveries in the Etruscan city Bomarzo, he declares that

The most remarkable article in bronze here found is a circular shield, about three feet in diameter, with a lance thrust in it, and its lining of wood, and braces of leather still remaining, after the lapse of more than two thousand years. . . . It was found suspended from the wall, near the sarcophagus of its owner, and the rest of his armour lying there with it—his embossed helmet, and his greaves of bronze, and his wooden-hilted sword of steel.

Furthermore, the thunder-bolt device, so conspicuous on the shield, could have come only from the land of the Thunder Calendar and of the nine thunder gods.

The Roman of old did not even blow his own horn, for numerous allusions attest the Etruscan extraction of the *tuba*. The most striking account tells how it was invented on a piratical expedition to sound the recall in windy weather.

Finally, as we shall see later, it was from the Etruscans that the Roman derived his ideas of fighting in ranks, and so began the evolution of the legion.

Having found among the Etruscans the genesis of almost the entire equipment of the legionary soldier we shall now present the various strata in the evolution of the individual pieces of armor.

There is no indication of the kind of sword in use in the Servian organization, but it was probably of bronze and resembled that of the Etruscans.

To the merits of the Gallic sword, which he found extreme difficulty in parrying, the Roman was introduced during the invasion of the Gauls. To Livy (22. 46.5) we are indebted for the information that it was unusually long, without a point, and adapted to slashing, not thrusting. This type continued in use till the Second Punic War.

In the battle of Cannae, the Romans formed a lasting attachment for the short Spanish broadsword. This type was pointed and intended for thrusting rather than for a sweeping blow. After the Spaniards had demonstrated the advantages of their article, the Romans, as we learn from Polybius, were not slow in discarding the weapons of their fathers and in adopting the Spanish model. This was essentially the kind carried by Caesar's men in Gaul.

In more modern times we have an instance of the vanquished resorting to the weapons of the victors. It is said that the Battle of the Standard was the first engagement in which the English peasantry used the long-bow, taking the hint, perhaps, from the carnage wrought by the Norman arrows at the Battle of Hastings.

In the gallant days of Romulus, the old Argive shield, according to the story of Plutarch (Romulus 21), was exchanged for the long Sabine *scutum*, the quasi-cylindrical type in which a soldier's body could safely nestle.

Livy (8.8.3) tells us that the *clipeus* was entirely dispensed with and that the use of the *scutum* be-

came general when the custom of paying the Roman soldier was inaugurated.

Yet there is a persistent tradition that the Romans imported their style of shield from the Samnites. This story is found in Pliny, the Book-Worm, Athenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius. When we turn to Livy, however (9.40.2-3), we learn that the Samnite shield was broad at the breast and shoulders, then tapered gradually like a wedge to the feet, whereas the *scutum* is oblong, as the Greek epithet *θυρεός*, 'door-shaped', applied to it, shows.

The Samnites had recourse to the tapering shield *mobilitatis causa*, 'to facilitate handling', which leads one to conclude that it was not the original type in use among them, but a special adaptation, in fact, a new style, designed especially for receptions held in honor of the Romans.

Possibly both Sabine and Samnite assisted in the evolution of the Roman type of *scutum*. This conclusion dovetails very neatly with the account of Diodorus, who, in speaking of the adoption of the *clipeus*, says that a plurality of nations furnished the model for the style of *scutum* in use in his own day.

There are several other types of shields. Of these, the *parma* or *parmula* was introduced from the land of the Bruttii, while tradition says that the *pelta* was invented by the Illyrici.

The *pilum* would seem to be an evolution of the *hasta*, though it is almost as difficult to date the change as to tell when a sapling becomes a tree.

Festus explains the term 'Samnite' as 'spearman', from the Greek *σάμνιον*. Indeed Strabo seems rather provoked that any other etymology should be suggested. In somewhat similar fashion, the Romans associated the term *Quirites* with *curis*, the Sabine word for *hasta*. Even if these explanations be merely instances of popular etymology, they show nevertheless that the *hasta* was the weapon par excellence of ancient Latium and Samnium.

Servius (on Aen. 1.292) feels aggrieved at the attempts to identify the Roman *pilum* with the Sabellian *veru*, and, as proudly as Quintilian says *Satura tota nostra est*, he asserts *pilum proprie est hasta Romana*, 'the pilum is characteristically Roman, just as the *gaesum* is Gallic and the *sarissa* is Macedonian'.

Lucan, too (Phars. 1.1), thought of the *pilum* as typically Roman. With such a tradition current among the Romans, one sees that his brief line, 'Eagles matched with eagles, *pila* arrayed 'gainst *pila*', was the most impressive way of indicating civil war.

The first distinctly Roman application of the spear may be assigned to the period of the early Gallic invasions. In order to offset the length and

weight of the Gallic *gladius* in the encounters subsequent to the sack of Rome, Camillus taught his troops how to use the long *hasta* (*ὄστος μακρός*) in hand-to-hand encounters, and to employ it to break the blows of the heavy swords of their opponents.

The next formal notice that it was time for the Roman to lengthen and strengthen his spear was probably served in the first engagements of the phalanx of Pyrrhus with the legion. The lighter weapon of the Romans failed to parry the lunge of the long menacing Macedonian *sarissa* (*grave iaculum*).

A recent writer¹ has shown that the *pilum*, i.e. a thrusting-spear which could be used as a missile also, closely resembles the Iberian *phalarica*, and to the stirring times following the onset upon Saguntum he dates the introduction of the *pilum* as such. What struck Livy as distinctive in the *phalarica* were the three feet of threatening iron tipping the wooden shaft, and the greater penetrating power resulting therefrom. The more extensive use of metal seems to be the contribution of the Iberians in the evolution of the spear, and this addition they were enabled to make through their unusual skill in iron-working.

To the fertility of Marius's brain was due another innovation in the *pilum*. One of the two iron pins joining the metal end with the wooden shaft was replaced by wood, thus weakening the weapon to such an extent that it was wrenched out of shape by the impact upon the shield. Caesar accomplished the same purpose by using soft iron for the end of the missile. The efficacy of the latter improvement is seen in the engagement with the Helvetii, where the metal yielded and clinched tightly together several of the enemy's shields. The device had the additional merit of preventing the return of the weapons with the compliments of the foe.

With so many incrustations in its development, one does not wonder that the origin of the *pilum* is somewhat obscure. The assigning of its invention to this or to that nation would seem to indicate merely the various strata in its evolution from the light *hasta* to the deadly weapon of Caesar's day.

Primitive protection for the head consisted, as we have already stated, of hide and fur. Indeed Propertius attributes to Romulus a *galea lupina*, a head-dress of wolf skin.

Head-gear was provided for in the Servian organization, yet, as long as the Romans were fighting men of their own size, they probably did not emphasize this method of defence. But when they met the six-foot Gauls, towering over them by head and shoulders, and slashing wildly like woodmen felling trees, the Romans began to bethink themselves.

¹ A. Schulten, *Der Ursprung des Pilums*, Rheinisches Museum, 1911, pp. 573 ff.

Camillus 'caused head-pieces entirely of iron to be made for most of his men, smoothing and polishing the outside, that the enemy's swords, lighting upon them, might either glide off or be broken'. This head-piece was the *cassis*, which, as we have seen, is in all probability Etruscan in origin.

The *cassis*, being of iron, was rather uncomfortable. Indeed, the degenerate soldiers of the Empire dispensed with it at times and entered battle depilated.

The purpose of the *crista* was the same as that of head-gear of more recent date, to add cubits to the stature and to command respect. But, says Livy, it is not crests that inflict wounds.

The *lorica*, or breast-plate, was brought into Latium from Etruria, if one may judge from the evidence of the monuments. Varro (L.L. 5.116) is sponsor for the statement that the Gauls were the first to hammer out a coat of chain mail, *lorica hamata*.

A description of the equipment of the legionary soldier would not be complete without reference to his method of transporting his personal baggage. To enable his troops to carry with greater facility their sixty pounds of *sarcinae* Marius devised a forked stick over which the burden dangled in a manner suggesting a horseman astride his mount. The contrivances were dubbed 'Marian mules' in the *sermo castrensis*, and the expression was soon applied to the troops themselves. Sculptures on Trajan's column aptly illustrate the method of carrying baggage.

In tracing the evolution of the Roman equipment, one cannot disregard the Samnite stratum, though what is contained therein is not at all clear. Sallust informs us that the Romans derived their *arma* from the Samnites, but we do not know how to interpret his statement. That it meant something distinctive is certain, since the term 'Samnites' was applied to a certain class of gladiators. The oblong shield is very prominent on many monuments. It will be recalled that the tradition of the Samnite origin of the *scutum* is reaffirmed several times. In addition to this, the Samnites were regarded as fine spearmen, and some scholars have thought that the *pilum* also came from Samnium. It seems, indeed, very probable that the Samnites were the 'chopping block' on which the Romans tested the merits of the recently organized manipular legion.

Niebuhr, however, attaches but little importance to the words of Sallust, and Mommsen is doubtful with regard to the Samnite origin of the shield, chiefly because of the Greek character of the word *scutum*.

The legion, the perfect fighting machine of imperial days is, of course, no phoenix-like growth, but the result of centuries of evolution. Its institution has been ascribed by Varro (L. L. 5.89) and Plu-

tarch (Rom. 13) to Romulus. The adventurers, however, who were enrolled under the founder of Roma Aeterna could not have been highly organized.

Significant is the statement of Athenaeus that the Romans derived the idea of the *στρατὶς μάχη*, 'fighting in ranks', from the Tyrrheni, or Etruscans, who advanced to the attack in phalanx formation.

The inference seems to be that the Romans had previously fought more or less in skirmish fashion, each man for himself, and that then they learned for the first time the value of concentrating in bodies and acting in coöperation.

After the primitive period, the next Polyphemus stride forward is the Servian phalanx, which closely resembled the Doric in equipment as well as in arrangement. "The Spartans", says Professor Botsford (History of Greece, 33), "perhaps as early as the 8th century B.C., invented the phalanx. . . . The new system commended itself to all intelligent Greeks and soon found its way to their colonies in Italy and in Sicily. Thence, one of the Tarquins, whom we shall call Servius, adopted it for his own state".

The compact character of the Servian phalanx is shown by Livy's comparison of it (8.8.3) to the phalanx of the Macedonians. The heavy arrangement was resolved later into the manipular legion, which was instituted by Camillus, as Weissenborn thinks (see his note on Livy 8.8.4), in order to break the onset of the Gauls by allowing fresh troops to advance between the contestants in the front line. The defects in the newer and lighter order of battle were revealed and remedied, in all probability, during the long wars with the Samnites.

The genius of Marius was responsible for still another innovation. In order to eliminate the intervals in the loosely organized manipular legion, he replaced the old arrangement by three lines of cohorts, thus preventing an enemy from forcing his way into the open spaces.

One of the distinctive features of the legion was its array of *signa*. In the days of Romulus there was carried as a standard a wisp of straw, attached to a pole. No one ventures to deny the Romans the honor of originality in this device. Before the days of Marius, however, this make-shift was replaced by the eagle, the wolf, the horse, the boar, and the minotaur—the last, according to the naïve Festus, because the plans of the general should be not less bewildering than the labyrinthine home of the minotaur. Marius was responsible for the exaltation of the bird of Jove to his high position as *the signum* of the legion. In recounting the event, Pliny (H. N. 10.16-17) dwells on the pugnacious qualities of the prince of *raptores*.

Dennis believes that the eagle came ultimately from the East. He cites a statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus to the effect that there was brought

from Etruria, amongst some insignia resembling those of the Lydian and the Persian monarchs, an eagle surmounted on a scepter.

More convincing, however, is the explanation that these ensigns date back to a time when the ancient Latins represented their gods in the guise of animals, the eagle typifying Jupiter, the wolf Mars, the boar Quirinus, the minotaur Jupiter Feretrius (the god of offensive war), the horse Jupiter Stator (the god of defensive war).

Before the end of the Empire, the animal kingdom was represented on Roman standards in numbers sufficient to gladden the heart of a Noah, for, as Rome's dominion widened, her soldiers came into contact with savage tribes and nations which displayed for the divine animals under whose conduct they marched the same veneration that the early Romans manifested for the beasts already mentioned.

In Etruria, the bull served as a standard. It is not strange that Taurus should be worshipped by some nation in the Italian peninsula, since *Italia* means 'the land of bulls'. Among the Gauls the boar was venerated, among the Dacians, Sarmates, and Parthians the dragon. In the East especially zoolatry was practised, and, under the influence of Oriental and zodiacal cults, many other figures of animals found resting places on Roman standards.

Diodorus (1.86) gives an account, which seems to be aetiological, of the origin of animal ensigns. The Egyptians, says he, after suffering several disasters through confusion in the ranks, began to use such insignia and so averted further loss. They refrained from killing these animals and the custom was, in consequence, transformed into a cult.

In poliorcetics, the Romans early in their career took lessons from the Etruscans. The city of Veii, for example, was fortified with walls, high and strong, and furnished with all manner of weapons, both offensive and defensive, and we can well believe that the Roman profited by this objective method of instruction.

His finishing school in siege-craft, as in so many other things, the Roman found among Hellenic peoples. From the Greeks, says Athenaeus, the Romans acquired their knowledge of the machines used in beleaguering, and, what is more important, surpassed their teachers. Diodorus gives us similar information, to the effect that the Romans learned from the Greeks how to shake walls. He does not forget the important postscript that the Romans later compelled the cities of their teachers to do their bidding.

Much of this knowledge the Romans undoubtedly assimilated during the three-year siege of Syracuse. The invaders viewed with open-mouthed astonishment the wonderful machines devised for the protection of this city.

The terms *catapulta*, *ballista*, *tribolus* sufficiently

attest their Greek origin, while the *aries*, *testudo*, *scorpio*, and the like were also ferried across the Adriatic.

As the knowledge of poliorcetics widened and the tendency to resort to sieges increased, the Romans were compelled to give to their encampment greater attention than when they were on the march. They must have profited by their ten years' experience at Veii.

Their ideas of castrametation were largely the result of their good common sense, but they also learned much from foreign nations. Pyrrhus reconnoitering the Roman position on the other side of the Siris is struck with admiration. Turning to his companion, he exclaims, "This is not the barbarian arrangement of barbarians" (see Plutarch, Pyrrhus 16).

Later in the year, after the Red King had taken flight, the Romans gained possession of one of his camps near Beneventum, and carefully noted the arrangement. Using that as a model, they have gradually evolved, says Frontinus, the method in vogue to-day. Frontinus (4.14) states further that previously detachments had been isolated, and that Pyrrhus was the first to encamp an entire army behind the same rampart. In view of Veii, this statement seems extravagant.

Livy, however (35.14.8), confirms part of the account. He represents Hannibal as placing Pyrrhus second only to Alexander because it was he who first showed how to measure out a camp, and because no commander displayed finer discernment in the selection of sites and in the disposition of guards. However much the chapter in Frontinus may be discounted, there is still a considerable residuum left, and we cannot doubt that Rome learned much from Pyrrhus about ordering her camp.

In choosing a site for an encampment, it was necessary to have abundant pasturage and good water for the animals; for, unlike business enterprises, military ventures cannot hope to succeed without well watered stock.

Let us now see how the Romans fared in Neptune's realm. By the time of the First Punic War, the policy of adopting the superior equipment of foreign nations was thoroughly ingrained in the Roman character, as is shown by the following incident. A Carthaginian embassy, in a final effort to avoid an exhausting war, told them it was foolhardy to isolate a land force without support from ships. "Why", said they, "you will soon be afraid to wash your hands in the Mediterranean!"

The Romans retorted that they would take a few lessons from the Carthaginians, for Roman pupils always ended by excelling their teachers. Familiar to all is the story that Polybius tells of the Romans using a wrecked Carthaginian quinquereme as a model, and, while the ships were building, having

gangs of men, seated high and dry, going through the motions of rowing.

The *corvus*, or crow, an arrangement like a draw-bridge, having attached to its end a sharp-pointed instrument like a baker's pestle, was an invention distinctly Roman. According to Polybius, the idea was suggested to Duilius by one of his seamen. It caused as much consternation off Mylae as did the Yankee Cheese-box in Hampton Roads at a much later date.

The principal naval tactics of antiquity were ramming and sweeping the banks of oars. These manœuvres were employed extensively in the harbor of Syracuse. The Roman ships were built especially for ramming, but their crews do not seem to have become as adept at the other method as were the Greeks.

Last, but not least, comes discipline. In this, says Athenaeus, the Romans patterned after the Spartans, but maintained it longer than did the inhabitants of Pelops's land.

During their early career, the Romans were willing to grace with their presence many demonstrations by foreign nations of the superiority of this or that weapon, but, being robust advocates of reciprocity, they always turned round and demonstrated on the demonstrators. They did not allow the foemen to meet them twice with better equipment.

In her infancy, Rome was not, politically speaking, more powerful than several of her neighbors. The germ of her future strength lay in a little acorn called adaptability. The Children of Mars adjusted their equipment to the needs of the hour. It is the old, old story of 'progressives' versus 'standpatters', with the sequel inevitable.

Yes, Rome was indebted to many foreign nations for arms and tactics, but "the indomitable courage was peculiarly her own". In *virtus*, call it 'sand', or 'spunk', or 'grit', the Roman needed no instruction.

Athenaeus remarks very pertinently that, in the olden days, the Roman adopted from his foes whatever was good, leaving the base, whereas now, says he, we are still learning from the enemy, but learning his vices as well as his virtues.

When Antisthenes was informed that one Ismenias was an excellent piper, he said: "It may be so, but he is a wretched human being: otherwise he could not have been so excellent a piper!"

If the "grandeur that was Rome" had consisted merely of excellent, in fact, unsurpassed military equipment and tactics, then we should call the Romans most wretched human beings. But since, in the wake of Roman armies, there followed law and education and civilization, we can condone the excellence of her martial equipment.

Thine, Roman, is the pilum:
Roman, the sword is thine,
The even trench, the bristling mound,

The legion's ordered line:
And thine the wheels of triumph,
Which with their laureled train
Move slowly up the shouting streets
To Jove's eternal fane.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

While there have appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY and The Classical Journal many excellent suggestions of devices for making students feel that there is a real connection between Latin and the life of to-day, none describes the plan I have pursued for several years.

When my classes in beginners' Latin, girls about thirteen or fourteen years old, have acquired a sufficient knowledge of vocabulary and pronunciation, I teach them a simple Latin hymn. While the Latin of the early Christian hymns may not be classical, young students are not affected by the difference; on the other hand, the likeness, both in meter and in rhythm, to English hymns makes it much easier to learn the hymns than to master classical poems. The rhyme is particularly helpful. After the students are able to recite the hymns and to translate them, I have them taught to sing them. As I choose those which can be sung to English hymn tunes, I gain an additional connection between English and Latin. I begin with the hymn *Puer natus in Bethlehem*, as it is simple and easily learned. This is always sung by the Latin classes to the whole school just before Christmas.

When the class is accustomed to memorizing the rhymed verses, I take up the more difficult subject of prose, and teach the Lord's prayer, the creed, and some of the chants and psalms. The girls are trained to sing these also. The sonorous roll of the great hymns and chants has been of much help in awakening an appreciation of the aesthetic value of Latin.

It takes very little time from the regular work to learn and recite a verse of a hymn or a psalm, and the gain is great in vocabulary and pronunciation, and even more in general interest, as the girls acquire an increasing fluency in what was at first remote and difficult.

I recently found a new means of linking the past with the present. An article appeared in the New York Times of November 10, by Lieutenant Wagner, the war correspondent with the Balkan allies, describing a battle with the Turks in terms so like those Caesar uses, that my Caesar class recognized at once my reason for reading it to them, and readily found for themselves the points of resemblance. The impression produced was so strong that I can recommend the use of this article to every Latin teacher as an effective means of arousing interest during a Caesar recitation.

ELIZABETH M. CARROLL,
HEAD MISTRESS, ARUNDELL SCHOOL, BALTIMORE.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 119th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editor

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

D'OOGÉ'S

Latin for Beginners

348 pages Fully illustrated
Price \$1.00

Latin for Beginners, written by an experienced teacher and leading author of Latin textbooks, presents the elements of Latin to younger pupils. The appearance of the book is extremely prepossessing, attracting the student at once with its clear type and splendid cuts—which include four excellent colored illustrations from the life of the ancient Romans. In subject-matter, the book shows throughout distinctive features that will make it of immediate and especial value to teachers desiring a thoroughly modern textbook.

D'Ooge's **Latin for Beginners** is an epoch-making book. Its strength is not merely local but extends throughout the country. It is now one of the most firmly established textbooks in the secondary schools of the United States.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London

The New Pearson

PEARSON'S ESSENTIALS OF LATIN FOR BEGINNERS (90 cents) has been revised and improved in accordance with the suggestions of many experienced teachers who have used it. All the changes have been carefully scrutinized by Dr. Charles Knapp of Columbia University, the Managing Editor of the **Classical Weekly**.

Further information on request.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

A LATIN GRAMMAR

By H. E. BURTON, Ph.D. *Professor of Latin, Dartmouth College.* 337 pages. 90 cents.

Special Merits of this Book:

Its live, vigorous quality—due to the fact that its author makes the pupil feel that Latin was once a living language.

Its clear arrangement and lack of confusing subdivisions.

Its effective method of showing the relative importance of the facts stated.

The fact that it is sufficiently simple for the beginners and sufficiently complete for the college student.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

231 West 39th Street

NEW YORK CITY

THE LAKE LATIN SERIES

Distinctive Features of these Texts: 1. Notes at the foot of the study page. 2. Separate texts free for class use. 3. Marked vowels.

WALKER'S CAESAR

Four-Book Edition, \$1.00 Seven-Book Edition, \$1.25

MILLER AND BEESON'S SECOND LATIN BOOK, - \$1.25

JOHNSTON & KINGERY'S CICERO

Six Orations, Letters and Sallust, - - - \$1.00

Ten Orations, Letters and Sallust, - - - 1.25

KNAPP'S VERGIL, - - - \$1.40

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 37 East 28th St., New York

The Back Volumes of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

MAY BE SECURED
BY WRITING TO

Professor Charles Knapp

Barnard College,

NEW YORK CITY

A Limited Number of Sets remains.
Price \$1.00 Per Volume.